

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



August 25, 2012

December 30, 2014

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 15584-review.doc).

Title: Exostoses of the external auditory canal.

Authors: David R Lobo MD, PhD.

Name of Journal: World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 15584

Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewers and editors of World Journal of Methodology for their constructive review and comments. We believe the manuscript has been improved thanks to these comments. We have incorporated the suggestions made by the reviewers and hope the manuscript is now considered suitable for publication.

Reviewer NO 00503686

- 1) Comment 1: “A well-written review! Please correct the word “conjunction” in line 33 in page 6”.

Response: I really appreciate the reviewer’s comment. I have proceeded accordingly.

Reviewer NO 00503779

- 1) Comment 1: “Please add an algorithm scheme for the surgical options and management of the exostoses”.

Response: An algorithm scheme for the management of exostoses and surgical options has been added as figure 1.

Reviewer NO 00503703

- 1) Comment 1: “The manuscript is well-written and includes a lot of useful information from the point of view of a clinician. It would be interesting for the reader to know which of the aforementioned studies, especially involving surgical results, have a high degree of evidence, or even to compare between studies according to the degree of evidence. In such a way practicing surgeons may make more informed decision in the future”.

Response: I do not think it is appropriate to compare the degree of evidence of the different articles evaluated in this review because there are a number of important limitations.

First, the populations studied by different authors are not completely homogeneous in their exposure to the various risk factors before and after surgery. Second, the severity of the exostosis is not identical among the different studies and in any case few reports specify the method used to assess the degree of stenosis or obliteration of the external auditory canal. Third, it does not seem appropriate to compare the evidence of the results obtained using different approaches and surgical techniques as these interventions are complex and require a learning curve and are conducted by teams with extensive experience in the procedure employed.

Finally, I consider that evaluating the degree of evidence exceeds the objectives set for this study. Although a broad review of the literature is presented, this is not a meta-analysis or a clinical guideline.

Reviewer NO 00503773

1) Comment 1:” This study is clearly presented. Also, this manuscript gives additional new knowledge to the literature. I think that this manuscript is suitable and worth to be published in World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology”.

Response: I thank the reviewer for his kind and encouraging comment.

1 Reference has been added.

Tears instead of Teras has been corrected in Table 2

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Methodology*.

Sincerely yours,

David Lobo, MD, PhD

Hospital El Escorial

Universidad Francisco de Vitoria

San Lorenzo de El Escorial 28200, Madrid

Spain

Fax: +34-918973031